

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 20-22, 24-25, 27, and 30-41 are now in the application. Claims 20-22, 24-25, 27, and 30-41 are subject to examination. Claims 20, 24, 25, 27, and 30-33 have been amended. Claims 26 and 28 have been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Applicants believe that the amendment does not present a new issue requiring further search or consideration and entry of the amendment is requested.

Dependent claims with allowable subject matter have been rewritten in independent form, claim objections have been addressed, and 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections have been addressed.

Under the heading "Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 27 because of an informality.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggested correction. Rather than using the exact language of "more than one O-ring", "an additional O-ring" has been defined. It is believed this language should be acceptable.

Under the heading "Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 31 and 32 under 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Claims 31 and 32 have been amended to depend from claim 30.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 26 and 27 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

With regard to claim 26, the Examiner stated that the liquid seal and the O-ring are the same element.

The limitations of claim 26 have been placed into claim 20 and these limitations have been rewritten to state: said O-ring preventing liquid from entering said at least one radial sliding bearing (7, 8). Support for the change can be found by referring to page 4, lines 30-33 of the specification. Claim 27 has been amended to depend from claim 20.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for clarification or cosmetic reasons. The changes are neither provided for overcoming the prior art nor do they narrow the scope of the claim for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 20, 21, 24, 28, 34, 35, 39 and 40 have been

rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,131,823 to Kalavsky under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The limitations of claim 26 have been added to claim 20. The Examiner stated that claim 26 would be allowable if the 112 rejection is overcome, and it is believed that the rejection has been overcome. Claim 20 and all claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentable.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 20-22, 24, 28, 34, 35 and 39 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,572,982 to Kozdon in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,762,461 to Ushikoshi under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The limitations of claim 26 have been added to claim 20. Claim 20 and all claims that depend therefrom are believed to be patentable.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 5 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 36 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,572,982 to Kozdon in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,762,461 to Ushikoshi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,708,313 to Bowes et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 36 depends from claim 20 and is believed to be patentable.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 41 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,572,982 to Kozdon in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,762,461 to Ushikoshi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,191,506 to Wright under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 41 depends from claim 20 and is believed to be patentable.

Under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 25, 30, 33, 37, and 38. The Examiner stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 25, 30 and 33 have been rewritten in independent form.

Under the heading "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 26 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections over 35 USC § 112.

The limitations of claim 26 have been placed into claim 20 and it is believed that the 112 rejection has been overcome.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 20, 25, 30, or 33. Claims 20, 25, 30, and 33 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on one of the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 20-22, 24-25, 27, and 30-41 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

The fee in the amount of \$220.00 for presenting one independent claim in excess of three has been enclosed.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Appl. No. 10/565,409  
Reply to Office Action of November 9, 2009  
Amdt. Dated February 5, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/  
Mark P. Weichselbaum  
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

February 5, 2010

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP  
P.O. Box 2480  
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480  
Tel.: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101